



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,001	12/15/2003	John D. Richter	14012-053001/50-03-034	2963
26230	7590	11/28/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			COLAN, GIOVANNA B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2162		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

M72

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,001	Richter, John D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Giovanna Colan	2162	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to the Amendment filed on 09/07/2007.
2. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 23 were amended. No claims were canceled. No claims were added.
3. This action is made Final.
4. Claims 1 –23 are pending in this application.
5. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/07/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation including "previous accessed items" recited in claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, and 23 is not clearly described in the specification.

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3 – 10, 12 – 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. (Win hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,182,142 B1, issued: January 30, 2001) in view of Joshi et al. (Joshi hereinafter) (US Patent Pub App. No. 2002/0091798 A1, filed: February 26, 2001).

Regarding Claims 1, and 10, Win discloses an article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

analyzing a plurality of database access statements that were issued for an application during the application's use (Col.2, lines 28 – 33, Win¹) to determine accessed items and types of access for the application (Col.2, lines 31 – 34, Win²)

¹ Wherein examiner interprets the step of controlling access, particularly by receiving access information and identifying resources authorized (as disclosed by Win) as the step of analyzing the database access statements as claimed.

² Wherein the resources correspond to the accessed items claimed; and the roles correspond to the type of access claimed.

However, Win does not explicitly disclose that such plurality access statements were issued during use to determine previous access items and types of access. On the other hand, Joshi discloses access statements that were issued for an application during use to determine previous accessed items and types of access for the application (Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Joshi's teachings to the system of Win. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Joshi (Page 1 and 17, [0016] and [0193], lines 13 – 17 and 7 – 19; respectively, Joshi), to be able to customize the resource being accessed for the user accessing the resource by, for example, determining whether the authentication scheme associated with the requested resource has been previously cached, and further determining the type of challenge method for authentication. In addition, both of the references (Win and Joshi) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, databases management systems, authorization, and authentication. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Furthermore, the combination of Win in of Joshi discloses:

developing a role for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application (Col. 2 and 14, lines 35- 47 and 40 – 48; respectively; **“...data entry form that accepts information defining a role. An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each role to be defined.** In response, Registry Server 108 stores information defining a role in the

Registry Repository 110. Each role is defined by a role identifier value, a role name, an associated functional group value, and a description..." Win; and Fig. 30, Page 7 and 17, [0108] and [0193], lines 19 – 25 and 14 – 19; respectively; "...The Identity Management System policy determines which users can view identity profile attributes **by defining a role by**, defining a rule, identifying persons by name, or listing an identified group. In one embodiment, the rule mentioned above is an LDAP rule..." Joshi), wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows the user database access (Col. 2, lines 39 – 40 and 47 – 49, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 14 – 19; "...If the challenge scheme was not found in step 1122, authentication event handler 512 loads the authentication rule associated with the requested resource from Directory Server 36...", Joshi).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses a method wherein the database access statements comprise Structured Query Language (SQL) queries (Col. 7, lines 9 – 11, Win).

Regarding Claims 4, and 12, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein the previous accessed items and types of access include objects accessed (Col. 2, lines 31 – 33, the resources, Win; Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi) and operations performed on the objects (Col. 2, lines 39 – 40, to use the resources, Win).

Regarding Claims 5, and 13, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein developing a role comprises determining permissions for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access (Col. 3, lines 34 – 44, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi).

Regarding Claims 6, and 14, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising determining which of a set of users are authorized to use the application (Col. 3, lines 13 – 14, Win).

Regarding Claims 7, and 15, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

determining whether a user request to establish an application session has been detected (Figure 5B, item 516, Col. 10, lines 29 – 34, a login attempt, Win);

finding the role for the application (Figure 5C, item 520 and 522, Col. 10, lines 57 – 63, Win); and

assigning the role to a user (Col. 13, lines 32 – 34, Win).

Regarding Claims 8, and 16, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein detecting a user request to establish an application session comprises determining if a user is authorized to use the application (Col. 13, lines 34 – 36, Win).

Regarding Claims 9, and 17, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an article wherein the instructions are further operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

detecting an end of the application session (Col.9 and 10, lines 45 – 47 and 39 – 42; respectively, Win); and

if an end of the application session is detected (Col.10, lines 39 – 42, Win), disabling the assigned role for the user (Col. 10, lines 42 – 45, Win).

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses a database security analyzer comprising:

a communication interface operable to receive a plurality of database access statements that were issued for an application during the application's use (Figure 9, item 918, Communication Interface, Col. 27, lines 17 – 31, Win);

a memory operable to store the issued database access statements (Figure 9, item 906, Main Memory, Col. 26, lines 8 – 15, Win); and

a processor (Figure 9, item 904, processor, Col. 26, lines 36 – 42, Win) operable to develop a role for the application based on the previously issued database access statements for the application (Col. 2 and 14, lines 35- 47 and 40 – 48; respectively;

"...data entry form that accepts information defining a role. An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each role to be defined. In response, Registry Server 108 stores information defining a role in the Registry Repository 110.

Each role is defined by a role identifier value, a role name, an associated functional group value, and a description..." Win; and Fig. 30, Page 7 and 17, [0108] and [0193], lines 19 – 25 and 14 – 19; respectively; "...The Identity Management System policy determines which users can view identity profile attributes **by defining a role by**, defining a rule, identifying persons by name, or listing an identified group. In one embodiment, the rule mentioned above is an LDAP rule..." Joshi), wherein when the application is in use by a user, the developed role for the application allows a user database access (Col. 2, lines 39 – 40 and 47 – 49, Win).

Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an analyzer wherein developing a role comprises:

analyzing the database access statements to determine previous accessed items and types of access for the application (Col. 2, lines 31 – 34, Win³; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi);

determining permissions for the application based on the previous accessed items and types of access for the application (Col. 3, lines 34 – 37, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi); and

developing a role associated with the application based on the determined permissions (Col. 2 and 14, lines 35- 47 and 40 – 48; respectively; "...**data entry form that accepts information defining a role. An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each role to be defined.** In response, Registry Server

108 stores information defining a role in the Registry Repository 110. Each role is defined by a role identifier value, a role name, an associated functional group value, and a description..." Win; and Fig. 30, Page 7 and 17, [0108] and [0193], lines 19 – 25 and 14 – 19; respectively; "...The Identity Management System policy determines which users can view identity profile attributes **by defining a role by**, defining a rule, identifying persons by name, or listing an identified group. In one embodiment, the rule mentioned above is an LDAP rule..." Joshi).

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an analyzer wherein the previous accessed items and types of access include objects accessed (Col. 2, lines 31 – 33, the resources, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi) and operations performed on the objects (Col. 2, lines 39 – 40, to use the resources, Win).

Regarding Claim 22, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses an analyzer wherein the memory comprises instructions (Figure 9, item 906, Col. 26, lines 8 – 12, Win), and the processor operates according to the instructions (Figure 9, item 904, Col. 26, lines 36 – 38, Win).

10. Claims 2, 11, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. (Win hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,182,142 B1, issued:

³ Wherein the resources correspond to the accessed items claimed; and the roles correspond to the type

January 30, 2001), in view of Joshi et al. (Joshi hereinafter) (US Patent Pub App. No. 2002/0091798 A1, filed: February 26, 2001), and further in view of Paulley et al. (Paulley hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,665,664 B2).

Regarding Claims 2, and 11, the combination of Win in view of Joshi discloses a article, wherein analyzing the issued database access statements comprises:

determining whether the plurality of database access statements have been captured (Figure 5B, item 516, Col. 10, lines 29 – 34, Win⁴);

The combination of Win in view of Joshi also discloses: normalizing the database access statements (Col.14, lines 15 – 17, Win) and eliminating redundancies in the database access statements (Col. 14, lines 15 – 19, Win).

However, the combination of Win in view of Joshi does not explicitly disclose: normalizing the captured database access statements; and eliminating redundancies in the normalized database access statements. On the other hand, Paulley discloses: normalizing the captured database access statements (Fig. 4A, item 401, 402, Col. 13, lines 34 – 44, Paulley); and eliminating redundancies in the normalized database access statements (Fig. 4A, item 403, 404, 405, Col. 14, lines 45 – 49, Paulley). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Paulley's teachings to the system of the combination of Win in view of Joshi. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by

of access claimed.

⁴ Wherein the step of recording a login attempt corresponds to the step of determining whether the database access statements have been captured as claimed. Specifically, the user's name and password correspond to the access statements claimed.

Paulley (Col. 8, lines 20 – 25, Paulley), to provide better optimization of the original SQL query without the system overhead that would result from full normalization. In addition, the applied references (Win, Joshi, and Paulley) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, databases management systems, normalization, and elimination of redundancies. This close relation between the applied references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 21, the combination of Win in view of Joshi and further in view of Paulley discloses an analyzer wherein developing a role comprises:

determining whether the received database access statements have been captured (Figure 5B, item 516, Col. 10, lines 29 – 34, Win⁵);
normalizing the captured database access statements (Col. 14, lines 15 – 17, Win; and Fig. 4A, item 401, 402, Col. 13, lines 34 – 44, Paulley); and
eliminating redundancies in the normalized database access statements (Col. 14, lines 15 – 19, Win; and Fig. 4A, item 403, 404, 405, Col. 14, lines 45 – 49, Paulley).

Regarding Claims 23, the combination of Win in view of Joshi and further in view of Paulley discloses a method comprising:

capturing a plurality of database access statements that were issued for one or more applications during the application's use (Figure 5B, item 516, Col. 10, lines 29 –

⁵ Wherein the step of recording a login attempt corresponds to the step of determining whether the database access statements have been captured as claimed. Specifically, the user's name and password correspond to the access statements claimed.

34, Win), wherein the database access statements comprise Structured Query Language (SQL) queries (Col. 7, lines 9 – 11, Win); normalizing the captured database access statements (Col. 14, lines 15 – 17, Win; and Col. 14, lines 15 – 17, Win; and Fig. 4A, item 401, 402, Col. 13, lines 34 – 44, Paulley); eliminating redundancies in the normalized database access statements (Col. 14, lines 15 – 19, Win; and Fig. 4A, item 403, 404, 405, Col. 14, lines 45 – 49, Paulley); analyzing the normalized database access statements to determine previous accessed items and types of access for an application (Col. 2, lines 31 – 34, Win⁶; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi), wherein the previous accessed items and types of access include objects accessed (Col. 2, lines 31 – 33, the resources, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi) and operations performed on the objects (Col. 2, lines 39 – 40, to use the resources, Win); determining permissions for the application based on previous the accessed items and types of access for the application (Col. 3, lines 34 – 37, Win; and Fig. 30, Page 17, [0193], lines 1 – 19, Joshi); developing a role for the application based on the previous determined permissions (Col. 2 and 14, lines 35- 47 and 40 – 48; respectively; **“...data entry form that accepts information defining a role. An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each role to be defined.** In response, Registry Server 108 stores information defining a role in the Registry Repository 110. Each role is

defined by a role identifier value, a role name, an associated functional group value, and a description..." Win; and Fig. 30, Page 7 and 17, [0108] and [0193], lines 19 – 25 and 14 – 19; respectively; "...The Identity Management System policy determines which users can view identity profile attributes **by defining a role by**, defining a rule, identifying persons by name, or listing an identified group. In one embodiment, the rule mentioned above is an LDAP rule..." Joshi);

determining which of a set of users are authorized to use the application (Col. 3, lines 13 – 14, Win);

detecting a user request to establish a session of the application (Figure 5B, item 516, Col. 10, lines 29 – 34, a login attempt, Win);

determining if the user is authorized to use the application (Col. 13, lines 34 – 36, Win);

if the user is authorized to use the application, finding the role for the application (Figure 5C, item 520 and 522, Col. 10, lines 57 – 63, Win);

assigning the role to the user (Col. 13, lines 32 – 34, Win);

detecting an end of the application session (Col. 9 and 10, lines 45 – 47 and 39 – 42; respectively, Win); and

if an end of the application session is detected (Col. 10, lines 39 – 42, Win), disabling the assigned role for the user (Col. 10, lines 42 – 45, Win).

⁶ Wherein the resources correspond to the accessed items claimed; and the roles correspond to the type of access claimed.

Response to Arguments

1. With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection regarding the limitation including “previous accessed items”, applicant states that the specification of the disclosure supports such limitation in page 4, lines 4-12, page 6, lines 4 –20, and page 8, lines 12-27. However, Examiner has only found support of the limitation including “accessed items”. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection is maintained.
2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).
3. Applicant argues that the applied art fails to disclose; “developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application”. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Win in view of Joshi does disclose the limitation of: developing a role for an application based on previous accessed items and types of access for an application (Col. 2 and 14, lines 35- 47 and 40 – 48; respectively; “...data entry form that accepts information defining a role. **An administrator may complete and submit the data entry form for each role to be defined.** In response, Registry Server 108 stores information defining a role in the

Registry Repository 110. Each role is defined by a role identifier value, a role name, an associated functional group value, and a description...”; wherein Examiner interprets the step of defining a role as the step of developing a role claimed; and wherein the information that is accepted in the data entry form corresponds to the accessed items and types of access for the application as claimed; Win; and Fig. 30, Page 7 and 17, [0108] and [0193], lines 19 – 25 and 14 – 19; respectively; “...The Identity Management System policy determines which users can view identity profile attributes **by defining a role by**, defining a rule, identifying persons by name, or listing an identified group. In one embodiment, the rule mentioned above is an LDAP rule...”; Joshi).

4. Applicant's arguments (such as, “The Win and the Joshi reference fail to teach at least this feature of the claim...”; and “Win and Joshi do not teach capturing, normalizing, and or eliminating redundancies in database statements...Paulley also fails to teach eliminating redundancies in database access statement...”) fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patently distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior Art Made Of Record

1. Win et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,142 B1, issued: January 30, 2001) disclose a distributed access management of information resources.
2. Menninger (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0069818 A1) discloses a system, method, and computer program product for creating contracts using a graphical user interface in a supply chain management framework.
3. Gold et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0102358 A1) discloses a web page monitoring and collaboration system.
4. Joshi et al. (US Patent Pub App. No. 2002/0091798 A1, filed: February 26, 2001).
5. Paulley et al. (US Patent No. 6,665,664 B2).

Points Of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Giovanna Colan
Examiner
Art Unit 2162
November 15, 2007

John Breene
John Breene
SP25, AR 2162